

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-21, 25-28, 30-36, 38, and 40-43 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat. No. 6,229,478 (hereafter Biacs) in view of Kee et al. or Batchelor et al. In addition, claims 1, 4-21, 25-28, 30-36, 38, and 40-43 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat. No. 5,899,957 (hereafter Loomis) in view of any one of Suzuoki et al., Hatch et al., or Martin. Applicant has amended claims 1, 4, 6, 8-21, 25, 28, 30, and 32. Applicant has canceled claims 5, 7, 31, 36, 38, and 40-43. Claims 3, 22-24, 37, and 39 were previously canceled. In view of the amendments and arguments set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that all remaining claims are in condition for allowance.

Claim Informalities

The Examiner has objected to claims 1-20 because these claims set forth an apparatus even though a system is described. These claims have accordingly been amended.

Claims 1 and 4

The Examiner has objected to claims 1 and 4 are being indefinite. These claims have been amended to address the issues noted by the Examiner and the Applicant believes the 35 USC 112 objection has been overcome.

Claims 1, 18, 21, and 32

Claims 1, 18, 21, and 32 have been amended to include an integrity

monitoring module and a measurements integration module (or the functionality of an integrity monitoring module and a measurements integration module).

The Applicant respectfully submits that these claims, as amended, are not taught or suggested in the prior art, as the prior art does not teach or suggest using an integrity monitoring module and a measurements integration module in combination with the previously recited claim limitations.

Regarding the integrity monitoring module, the Examiner has incorrectly argued in a previous Office Action that this limitation is known. As stated by the Examiner on page 2 of the Office Action dated November 24, 2004, “[t]he fact that the server station receives the satellite health data from the reference stations leads to the fact that its use as an integrity monitoring station is fulfilled since the satellite health data inherently provides information with regard to the use/non-use of the satellite.” Finally, the Examiner states on page 3 of that Office Action that the prior art teaches an integrity monitoring module “since Biacs et al. clearly suggest selecting information from the nearest reference station(s).”

The functionality described by the Examiner that is taught by Biacs is completely different from the true function of the claimed integrity monitoring module. The Examiner has focused on satellite health. As described in the Applicants' specification on page 15, however, “[t]he integrity monitoring module helps ensure the integrity of correction information generated by the correction information calculation module 120 by monitoring the quality of data input to the correction information calculation module 120. Thus, the integrity monitoring module 350 detects and excludes data that reflects a failure of some

sort on the part of one of the reference receivers at a base station (or the transmission facilities between the receiver and the correction information calculation module). The integrity monitoring module 350 may detect reference receiver failure due to a variety of causes, including cycle slip and code multipath errors."

As shown, satellite health is not even considered in the description of the integrity monitoring module. Rather, it is errors introduced by the reference receivers that are addressed and eliminated. Furthermore, and most importantly, claims 1, 18, 21, and 32 specifically state that the integrity monitoring module monitors the received base station location information and prevents "base station location information that has been corrupted from being used by the correction information calculation module." The claims specifically exclude satellite health data because the claims are limited to corrupted base station location information.

Regarding the measurements integration module, the Applicants' specification on pages 15-16 states that this element "stochastically integrates the individual reference measurements to compute the final correction information.... In some embodiments, the measurements integration module 360 provides adaptive integration of LAAS pseudo-range and carrier-phase reference measurements to generate correction information for transmission to the precise location calculation module. Such adaptive computation capabilities may help provide a robust location solution amenable to the demands of varying terrain and continuously changing locations of mobile devices." This functionality is also not disclosed by the prior art.

Accordingly, the Applicants believe that the integrity monitoring module and the measurements integration module of claims 1, 18, 21, and 32 are not

taught or suggested by Biacs, or by any of the other prior art of record, and therefore these claims are novel over the prior art.

Claim 21

Claim 21 has been further amended to include a “localized data services module” that provides localized information based on a location computed using the correction information. This is described on pages 13-14 of the Applicant’s specification, which describes the localized data services module as providing services such as personal navigation, vehicle navigation, localized marketing applications, localized services applications, fleet tracking, enhanced 911 services, telematics, localized advertisements for goods, localized advertisements for services, localized purchase incentives, and localized billing for phone services.

The Applicant believes that a localized data services module, in combination with the other elements of claim 21, is not disclosed by the prior art. The Applicant therefore believes that this provides yet another reason for the allowance of claim 21.

Conclusion

The Applicant submits that all claims now pending are in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner requires further information, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner call the undersigned at his earliest convenience to discuss the allowability of the claims. The undersigned can be reached at 512-732-3919. The Applicant requests that any deficiency in fees be charged to our Deposit Acct. No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 30, 2005 /Rahul D. Engineer/
Rahul D. Engineer
Reg. No. 47,548

Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030
(310) 207-3800

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on:

December 30, 2005 _____
Date of Deposit

Gigi Hoover _____
Name of Person Mailing Correspondence
Gigi Hoover 12-30-05
Signature Date